

Appn. Ser. No.: 09/460,455
Atty Docket No.: 96-3-511 CONRCE2
Customer No.: 32127

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Response in response to the Office Action mailed October 17, 2005. Applicant has amended claims 7 and 50, canceled claims 1-6, 13-49 and 56-70 (without prejudice to re-presenting the subject matter of these claims at a later time), and added new claims 71-82. Claims 7, 9, 10, 12, 50, 53-55, 71-82 are currently pending. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18-22, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 36, 39, 41, 44, 50, 53-56, 59-66 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,727,159 to Kikinis ("Kikinis"). The Examiner further rejected claims 40, 45 and 70 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,013 to Mighdoll et al. ("Mighdoll"). As Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 15, 16, 18-22, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 36, 39-41, 44, 45, 56, 59-66, 69 and 70, the rejections as to these claims is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims based on the following.¹

Kikinis describes a "hand held computer 13" which is connected to a "Proxy Server 19." (Kikinis, col. 4, ll. 17-24.) A user of the hand-held computer can enter a URL for a web site, which is sent to the proxy server. (Id., col. 9, ll. 61-67; Figure 4.) Proxy Server 19 retrieves the HTML page of the requested site and any images associated with the internet page from a web server 23. (Id., col. 10, ll. 9-18.) Proxy Server 19 converts the received images into a format appropriate to the hand-held device, and combines the HTML and converted images into a new single file, described as an "HT-Lite" or "HTL" file. (Id., col. 10, ll. 19-30.) The HTL file is sent to the hand held unit 13 and the HTL file is "dumped" to the screen of the hand-held device. (Id., col. 10, ll. 30-33; Figure 4.) Kikinis does not describe any further processing to the HTL file at the hand-held field unit, which is consistent with the description of the HTL file being

¹ As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

Appn. Ser. No.: 09/460,455
Atty Docket No.: 96-3-511 CONRCE2
Customer No.: 32127

“dumped” to the screen of the hand-held field unit. Kikinis also does not describe the contents of the HTL file – it merely states that the proxy server translates HTML and other files into “a form readily usable without extensive additional processing by the hand-held unit.” (Id., col. 7, ll. 17-20.)

In rejecting claim 1,² the Examiner states that “Kikinis teaches ... means for recomposing [NanoBrowser on the handheld device] the second information to form third network information for the user device [parsed data from the HTL file, page portions and page position information – see col. 10 lines 46-56].” (Office Action, pages 4-5.) The Examiner is apparently referring to the description in Kikinis of the “auxiliary small display.” (Kikinis, col. 10, lines 52-56.) Even if this description in Kikinis were analogous to the recited means for recomposing (which Applicants do not concede), the described auxiliary display is not described as presenting “third network information” that includes the recited “interactive elements” of claims 7 and 50. In fact, Kikinis describes this auxiliary display as merely presenting information relative to the position of the page currently displayed on the main screen – not the content of the page itself. (Id., col. 10, lines 52-56.) Moreover, Kikinis does not describe any further processing to the HTL file at the hand-held field unit. Accordingly, Kikinis fails to teach any “recomposing” of second network information to form third network information including the interactive elements, or any means for such recomposing, or any recomposing devices that perform such recomposing.

As Kikinis does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned elements of claims 7 and 50, Kikinis cannot anticipate these claims. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 7 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Claims 9, 10, and 12 depend from claim 7. Claims 53-55 depend from claim 50. Since Kikinis fails to teach each and every element of independent claims 7 and 50, that reference also fails to teach each and every element required by the respective dependent claims, and Applicant believes these claims to be patentable over Kikinis for at least the same reasons as their respective base

² The Examiner has applied the rationale for rejecting claim 1 to claims 7 and 50, (see Office Action, p. 5), thus Applicant will address the Examiner’s assertions as to claim 1.

Appn. Ser. No.: 09/460,455
Atty Docket No.: 96-3-511 CONRCE2
Customer No.: 32127

independent claims.³ Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9, 10, 12, and 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn as well.

Applicant has added new claims 71-82. Support for these claims (by way of description of preferred embodiments thereof) may be found throughout the specification, for example, as described in pages 12-16 and illustrated in Figures 6-8. Applicant believes these claims to be patentable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests favorable consideration thereof by the Examiner.

³ As Applicant's remarks with respect to the base independent claims are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections of all claims dependent therefrom, Applicant's silence as to the Examiner's assertions with respect to dependent claims is not a concession by Applicant to the Examiner's assertions as to these claims, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions in the future.


Appn. Ser. No.: 09/460,455
Atty Docket No.: 96-3-511 CONRCE2
Customer No.: 32127

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues which need to be resolved to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative by phone at the number indicated below to discuss such issues. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to deposit account number 07-2347. With respect to this application, please charge any other necessary fees and credit any overpayment to that account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 17, 2006


Joseph R. Palmieri
Reg. No. 40,760

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
600 Hidden Ridge Drive
Mail Code: HQE03H14
Irving, Texas 75038
(972) 718-4800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent Office at 571-273-8300.

Dated: April 17, 2006

Signature:  (Christian R. Andersen)